

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALEX ANG, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
BIMBO BAKERIES USA, INC.,  
Defendant.

Case No. 13-cv-01196-HSG

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE  
COURT SHOULD NOT STAY THIS  
ACTION PENDING RESOLUTION OF  
THIRD-PARTY APPEALS**

On February 18, 2015, Plaintiffs Alex Ang and Lynn Streit moved for class certification in this action. Dkt. No. 102. The parties fully briefed the motion and the Court held a hearing on the matter on May 6, 2015. Dkt. No. 133. Since that time, two appeals have remained pending in the Ninth Circuit that address important questions of law that are at issue in this case. Those appeals are *Jones v. ConAgra Foods, Inc.*, No. 14-16327 (9th Cir. Nov. 24, 2014), which addresses the issue of ascertainability in low-cost consumer class actions, and *Brazil v. Dole Packaged Foods, LLC*, No. 14-17480 (9th Cir. Dec. 18, 2014), which addresses the proper standard to apply to damages models under *Comcast Corp. v. Behrend*, — U.S. —, 133 S. Ct. 1426, 1432 (2013).


In light of those pending appeals, several courts in this district have stayed cases similar to this one. *E.g.*, *Koller v. Med Foods, Inc.*, No. 14-CV-02400 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 14, 2015); *Samet v. Kellogg Co.*, No. 12-CV-1891, 2015 WL 6954989, at \*2 (N. D. Cal. Nov. 10, 2015) (partial stay); *Thomas v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, 12-CV-02908, 2015 WL 6674696, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 2, 2015); *Park v. Welch*, No. 12-CV-06449, Dkt. 77 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2015); *Astiana v. Hain Celestial Group, Inc.*, No. 11-CV-06342, Dkt. 114 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2015); *Wilson v. Frito-Lay North America*, No. 12-CV-1586-SC, 2015 WL 4451424, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2015); *Leonhart v. Nature's Path Foods, Inc.*, No. 13-CV-00492, 2015 WL 3548212, at \*3-4 (N.D. Cal.

1 June 5, 2015); *Pardini v. Unilever United States*, No. 13-CV-01675, 2015 WL 1744340, at \*3  
2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 15, 2015); *Allen v. ConAgra Foods*, No. 13-CV-01279 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2015);  
3 *Parker v. J.M. Smucker Co.*, No. 13-CV-00690 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2014) (Dkt. No. 74);  
4 *Gustavson v. Mars, Inc.*, No. 13-CV-04537, 2014 WL 6986421, at \*2-4 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014).

5 For these reasons, the Court hereby **ORDERS** the parties to show cause why a similar stay  
6 should not issue in this case. The parties are directed to meet and confer, then submit briefs of no  
7 longer than five pages setting forth their position on the propriety of a stay by April 1, 2016. If the  
8 parties agree one way or the other, they may submit a joint statement reflecting their shared  
9 position. After reviewing the parties' filing(s), the Court will determine whether further briefing  
10 on the issue is appropriate.

11  
12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 Dated: March 25, 2016

14  
15   
16 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
17 United States District Judge  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28